

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SECTION
600 EAST BOULEVARD AVENUE – DEPT 301
BISMARCK, ND 58505-0200**

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| SOLICIATION NUMBER AND TITLE: | 301-05-001 Air Quality Database Update |
| RFP DUE DATE: | January 24, 2006 2:00 P.M. CST |
| AMENDMENT NUMBER: | 02 |
| DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: | January 13, 2006 |

Section 1.03 of the solicitation established a deadline for receipt of questions. The responses to these questions are provided as addenda to the solicitation. When necessary, the solicitation has been amended:

1. Question: I was wondering what kind of audit the state requires for the bid. Would a letter of review be sufficient?

Response: If company size, organization, date of incorporation, ownership, number of employees, revenues for the last fiscal year, audited financial statement for the three most recent years and any information relevant to this RFP are included.

No amendment necessary.

2. Question: Some states allow emission sources to trade emissions with other sources and the State keeps track of this. Is this something that North Dakota tracks?

Response: Our database tracks whether the source is an Acid Rain source and tracks annual emissions from the source, but does not track the trading of emissions between sources.

No amendment necessary.

3. Question: Are the permits and reports stored electronically?

Response: Yes, permits and reports are created in WordPerfect and are stored on the network. We may convert these to a PDF format in the future.

No amendment necessary.

4. Question: Does the Department want the actual document on the network or does the Department desire the ability to create the document using the database?

Response: The document (permit, inspection report, etc.) will be stored on the network and will only need to be accessed. The Department does not desire the ability to generate the document with the database system.

No amendment necessary.

5. Question: Are there specifications for what EPA's data needs are?

Response: Yes, there are several hyperlinks to EPA websites in the RFP. There are essentially two areas where EPA needs data. One is the National Emissions Inventory and EPA has a document which specifies the required format and lists all the data elements required by EPA. (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/nif/index.html>) The NEI Input Format Document is found at:

http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/nif/nif30/nifv3_userguideapr03_revnov2003.pdf

The current emission inventory database used by the Department follows the EPA-required format fairly closely as it is only two years old.

The second area where EPA requires data is the AIFS system. There are hyperlinks to this system in the RFP. There are minimum data requirements that need to be submitted to EPA (source, source type, location, name, address, contact, pollutants, air programs, inspections, enforcement actions, etc.). The web site for the AIFS Site is:

<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/data/systems/air/aboutaifs.html>. The web site to the

Summary of National Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) for the Clean Air Act Stationary Source is:

<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/publications/data/systems/air/mdrshort.pdf>

No amendment necessary.

6. Question: Does the Department currently have access to the EPA databases?

Response: The information the Department must report to EPA's AIFS System is currently entered into the EPA AIFS database using an emulator that acts like a dumb terminal connection through a web browser to enter the EPA system. The emission inventory database goes through EPA's Central Data Exchange (CDX). Information is put into Microsoft Access tables and this is sent into the CDX system. CDX can also handle data in XML format and EPA has developed XML schemas for the different data flows. CDX takes the data submitted and puts it into the appropriate EPA data system.

No amendment necessary.

7. Question: What forms of entry does the Department currently use to enter data?

Response: The database programs are on a network and all Air Quality Program staff have access to the databases. Each program staff hand enters data for the sources that they track. Some entries (such as emission inventories) are done by one person.

No amendment necessary.

8. Question: Is there a desire to have the data entry web enabled?

Response: If there is shown to be a benefit, the Department would consider this option; however, we do not currently see a compelling need for it.

No amendment necessary.

9. Question: What Access version is the Department currently using?

Response: The current database is in Access 2000 format and is running in Access XP.

No amendment necessary.

10. Question: How is data entered into the current database?

Response: Data is entered manually by AQPCP staff into the two program databases and also into the EPA - AFS database. AEIR Data that has been entered into the state AEIR database is batch uploaded to EPA's NEI database using EPA's CDX.

No amendment necessary.

11. Question: What is the size of the current database?

Response: The permitting/compliance/enforcement database is ~6 MB. The emission inventory database is ~13 MB.

No amendment necessary.

12. Question: Does the Department store any hourly emissions data or is all of the data annual emissions data.

Response: For emissions, the Department only stores annual emissions data in the database.

No amendment necessary.

13. Question: Will the Department be upgrading to Access 2003?

Response: The Department is not currently running Access 2003 and there is currently no time frame established to upgrade to Access 2003. The Department will have to discuss the possibility with program management, but it could be a possibility.

No amendment necessary.

14. Question: Is the Department open to running on platforms other than Access 2003?

Response: The Department is open to other platforms. The current database is in Access and the Department is familiar with Access; however, we are open to the use of any Microsoft Visual Basic development environment. As stated in the RFP, we will make the determination as to the appropriate development environment with input from the contractor.

No amendment necessary.

15. Question: Would the Department be open to the use of .Net?

Response: Yes. The .Net framework is installed, but the Department has no familiarity with .Net. We have framework for 1.1 and 2.0.

No amendment necessary.

16. Question: Does the Department have SQLServer licenses?

Response: Yes. If a SQLServer Database is used, the department would go through the state Information Technology Department (ITD), who would host it. ITD has licenses for SQLServer. The department would have to pay a monthly hosting fee for this service.

No amendment necessary.

17. Question: Is it possible for the contractors to see the existing database?

Response: Yes, the Department will make the database available. A ZIP file with the Departments two databases and other related documents is on the department website at:

<http://www.health.state.nd.us/AQ/Notices.htm>. It is titled **Downloads for RFP Number: 301-05-001**

No amendment necessary.

18. Question: Does the Department want the data in the existing database to be ported to the new application?

Response: Yes, the department would like data that is applicable to the new database and that can be ported to the new databases to be ported over as part of this project.

No amendment necessary.

19. Question: Is there a list of reporting needs?

Response: Yes, the reports are in the RFP. The Department can describe the required reports in more detail if necessary.

No amendment necessary.

20. Question: Is there flexibility to deal with a change in the scope of the project?

Response: The Department does not foresee the scope of the project changing from the scope outlined in the RFP. Some flexibility should be built into the bid to account for the fact that some work will be necessary to flesh out the detail needed to meet the requirements necessary to complete the project as outlined in the RFP.

No amendment necessary.

21. Question: Should the bid include training?

Response: Yes, training must be included in any proposal. The proposal calls for both general user training and administrator training.

No amendment necessary.

22. Question: The RFP lists six standard letters which must be generated by the system and then states "etc." Does the Department have an estimate as to the number of letters required?

Response: The letters listed are the majority that will be required; however, there may be a few more which will be identified as the database is developed.

No amendment necessary.

23. Question: Should the initial bid be for the entire project?

Response: Yes. The scope of the project has been defined, but the specific details of how the system must be designed to meet the requirements of the project must be worked out. The initial bid should include the entire project and the contractor should plan on spending some time to work out the specific details that will be necessary to make the system work as desired.

No amendment necessary.

24. Question: How many employees will need to be trained?

Response: Approximately 10-12 with all employees in one location. The Department is requiring one set of training for users of the system and one set of training for system administrators.

No amendment necessary.

25. Question: Will there be multiple administrators assigned to the database?

Response: The Department foresees two people with administrator roles.

No amendment necessary.

26. Question: What type of security does the current system have?

Response: The current system is on a network and each air quality staff member has access to it. The Department envisions a new system where Air Quality Program staff members have full access to the data, but do not have access to change the application or administrative tables. It should also have the capability to give some users read only access (if staff members from other programs need access to the data) and there should be administrative access for a limited number of people who can get into all of the tables including administrative tables and to be able to update the application.

No amendment necessary.

27. Question: Is the current database accessible?

Response: Yes. We will put the current database on our web site. A ZIP file with the Departments two databases and other related documents is on the department website at: <http://www.health.state.nd.us/AQ/Notices.htm>. It is titled **Downloads for RFP Number: 301-05-001**

No amendment necessary.

28. Question: Will the method to export data to EPA be in XML format?

Response: That is what the Department would prefer, and the format that EPA is encouraging be used for data to be submitted using CDX . The AFS system does not currently have an XML Schema developed by EPA, so it would have to be exported in a flat format which would have to be uploaded using the emulator into the AFS system. This would need to be done until an XML Schema is developed for AFS data and EPA's CDX can accept AFS data.

No amendment necessary.

29. Question: What is the required completion date?

Response: The project must be completed by January 1, 2007; however, the Department would like it to be completed much sooner than that if possible.

No amendment necessary.

30. Question: Would it be possible to get copies of the AEIR Summary Excel spreadsheet?

Response: Yes. A ZIP file with the Departments two databases and some of the excel spreadsheets, is on the department website at: <http://www.health.state.nd.us/AQ/Notices.htm>. It is titled **Downloads for RFP Number: 301-05-001**

We have included two Excel documents and each one has multiple copies of the spreadsheet showing how they are filled out for different sources.

Following is a brief description about how the AEIR Spreadsheets are used. When a permitted source sends in its AEIR form, program staff review the form, then fill out the top portion of the spreadsheet including the chart called "Individual Emission Sources". This data is then summarized in the bottom chart called "NEI Summary". The NEI Summary data is then hand entered into the NEI Database. Our intent would be to just enter the AEIR data into the updated database rather than having to use the excel spreadsheet, and have the database summarize the data. One sheet is filled out for each Source, and the spreadsheets are currently stored separately. The spreadsheets were combined into the two Excel documents just to make the documents cleaner for you to review. The information the program is proposing to have retrieved from the spreadsheet and uploaded into the database is EUI, Source Unit, Fuel and possibly the Parameter and its associated data, all of which are in the "Individual Emission Sources" table at the top of the spread sheet. The EUI, Source Unit, and Fuel are items that should only need to be entered into the database one time, so retrieving this information from the excel spreadsheet would prevent the need to have to hand enter this data.

No amendment necessary.

31. Question: Pg. 17 - Oil well database. Please explain the status of this, its format and size, and other relevant information that might impact a link to this by the air quality database.

Response: The RFP indicates on page 17 "... The AQPCP is developing a database of oil wells within the state. Complaints received regarding an oil well should be able to be linked to the Oil well in the Oil well database." This oil well database is in final testing phase, and is developed in Microsoft Access. However, the Oil well name and location information, which is the information of interest for this project, is in a linked Microsoft SQLServer database maintained by a different state agency, the Oil and Gas Division of the State Industrial Commission. This SQLServer database has about 16,458 oil well records and the Air Quality Permitting and Compliance (AQPCP) has read access to the tables in this database.

The AQPCP only gets a few complaints related to oil wells each year so they would be looking for a very simple means of being able to associate a complaint with an Oil well, such as storing a well name and/or Primary Key or some limited information like that. The intent would be to be able to link a complaint to a specific Oil well. The preferred method would be to just link to the appropriate SQLServer table as a lookup table to store this basic Oil well Identification information. Another alternative would be to create an Oil well lookup table in the updated AQPCP database and have program staff periodically update this table. Again because of its limited use, this should be something that can be done fairly simply and would not require a lot of programming effort.

No amendment necessary.

32. Question: Pg. 16 at top - EHS Facility Profiler and facility profiler mapping tool. Please explain the use of this profiler/mapping tool, and other relevant information that might impact a link to this by the air quality database.

Response: The facility profiler is a database system that collects facility name and location information from several program databases within the Environmental Health Section, and allows them to be queried and displayed from one location using a web based application. Both the Facility Profiler and the Mapping tool are web applications. To meet the condition listed on page 16 of the RFP, it would require a hyperlink that passes a URL with the FPID(also called the state ID field) as part of the URL and opens up a web browser. The

Facility Profiler and the Mapping tool are two separate URLs, but they both use the same FPID for identifying a facility site.

The Updated database system will also need to be integrated into the Facility Profiler Warehouse database, so all of the facility information will be available in the Facility Profiler. This is not part of the main proposal, but is listed as a value added feature on page 23 of the RFP, which a contractor can propose above and beyond the requirements of the RFP. The AQPCP anticipates having the contractor who implemented the Facility Profiler do this work, however if a contractor who is bidding on the project has familiarity with the Facility Profiler and can do this, we would welcome this as a value added feature that could be proposed and bid separately above and beyond the bid for the required work within RFP.

No amendment necessary.

33. Question: Pg. 22 - The second sentence in this section appears to be an incomplete sentence -can you clarify its meaning?

Response: We were not clear of the exact phrase being referred to, but it appears that it was in the second paragraph on page 22 titled "Contractor-Furnished Property". The second sentence in this paragraph is intended to indicate that the contractor must provide and arrange for their necessary transportation to the state for contractor staff to attend any meetings needed for evaluation, testing, training and implementation of the developed database system.

No amendment necessary.

34. Question: Pg. 23 - Value added features. Should the sum total of these including the basic level of effort not exceed \$125,000 or else the proposal will be disqualified? Alternatively, would it be acceptable to propose several value added features that, when added individually to the basic level of effort, might be less than \$125,000 although in total they might exceed \$125,000 when added to the basic level of effort?

Response: The contractor should provide a bid for what is requested in the RFP not including the value added features. This is necessary so we can evaluate each proposal for doing the same work. Bids for the work needed to meet the requirements of the main RFP must not exceed \$125,000. The value added features are items that are above and beyond the work required in the RFP. Each value added item proposed must have a cost associated with it and the AQPCP will evaluate each value added item proposed. The cost of the main RFP plus value added features proposed may exceed \$125,000 without being disqualified, provided the cost associated with the main requirements of the RFP (not value added items) does not exceed \$125,000.

No amendment necessary.

35. Question: Pg. 25 at bottom - "...all necessary affirmative steps to assure that minority firms, women's business enterprises and labor surplus area firms are used when possible in the procurement or purchase of supplies, equipment and services in relation to this contract." Please describe what is required by "all necessary affirmative steps."

Response: EPA lists the following steps to be used to ensure Minority Business Enterprise/Women's Business Enterprise (MBE/WBE) are used when possible in relation to this contract. These should be done to the best of your ability.

1. Inclusion of MBEs/WBEs on solicitation lists.
2. Assure MBEs/WBEs are solicited once they are identified.
3. Where feasible, divide total requirements into smaller tasks to permit maximum MBE/WBE participation.

4. Where feasible, establish delivery schedules which will encourage MBE/WBE participation.
5. Encourage use of the services of the U.S. Department of Commerce's Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) and the U.S. Small Business Administration to identify MBEs/WBEs.
6. Require that each party to a subgrant, subagreement, or contract award take the affirmative steps outlined here.

No amendment necessary.

Vendors are instructed to acknowledge receipt of and compliance with this amendment by signing below and returning this acknowledgement with your bid or proposal.

Any questions regarding this amendment must be submitted in writing to the undersigned Procurement Officer.

Karen Haas, Procurement Officer
PHONE: 701.328.3325
FAX: 701.328.4727
TTY Users Call: 711
E-MAIL: khaas@state.nd.us

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

By my signature below, I hereby acknowledge this amendment to the above referenced solicitation.

Name of Company

Signature

Date